

REMARKS

Claims 56-99 are pending in this application, with claims 56, 72, 89, and 90 being independent.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for the thoughtful courtesies and kind treatment afforded to Applicants' representative, Babak Akhlaghi, during the personal interview conducted on April 26, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner kindly suggested the following process to further prosecution: (1) Applicants submit new proposed amendments further limiting the claims, (2) the Examiner performs a search against the new proposed amendments, and (3) Applicants file a request for continued examination based on the new proposed amendments, modified to the extent necessary and agreed upon to amplify novelty in view of discovered art.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Applicants submitted to the Examiner new independent claims 56 and 72 in an attempt to more clearly define the scope of the previously submitted independent claims 1 and 55. During the telephonic interview conducted on May 24, 2007, the Examiner kindly suggested that additional search was performed and new independent claim 72 is deemed allowable and new independent claim 56 would be allowable if Applicants amend claim 56 to include a feature positively reciting that the user-requested telephone billing for the charges that are incurred incident to receipt of the requested services offered by or through the ISP is enabled when it is determined that the number of users does not exceed the threshold.

In reliance on the Examiner's assertion, Applicants have further amended claim 56 to include such feature. In particular, claim 56 recites, among other features, "enabling user-requested telephone billing for the charges that are incurred incident to receipt of the requested services offered by or through the ISP when it is determined that the number of users does not exceed the threshold."

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of claims 56 and 72, along with their independent claims. To this end, Applicants hereby submit a Request for Continued Examination.

Applicant : Richard Rodriguez-Val et al.
Serial No. : 10/032,006
Filed : December 31, 2001
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-179001 / Commerce 04

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112


Claims 29 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Although, claims 29 and 55 have been canceled, it was agreed during the interview that the specification fully supports the subject matter of claims 29 and 55.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance and such action is courteously solicited.

The fee in the amount of \$120.00 for the Extension of Time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06 1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/31/2007


Babak Akhlaghi
Reg. No. L0250

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331